

## **REMARKS**

By the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS--35 U.S.C. § 102**

Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,400,700. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Examiner states that U.S. '700 "discloses a cooker with [an] outer shell 3, cooker bowl 1, and 'interlaid backstops' 5 therebetween so as to maintain a [sic] 'air gap.'" However, claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitation of cooker bowl having a radially shrunk bottom part in the shape of a either a step or a conical cylinder. Patent '700 does not teach or disclose this limitation. Therefore, patent '700 does not anticipate the present invention and claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, should be allowed.

Examiner has also rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,262,398. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Examiner states that the '398 patent discloses a cooker with outer shell 12, cooker bowl 14, a plurality of "interlaid backstops" 21. However, claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitation of cooker bowl having a radially shrunk bottom part in the shape of a either a step or a conical cylinder. Patent '398 does not teach or disclose this limitation. In fact, patent '398 discloses a bowl of "generally rectangular shape." Therefore, patent '398 does not anticipate the present invention and claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, should be allowed.

Examiner has also rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,002,111. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Examiner states that the '111 patent discloses a cooker with outer shell 2, cooker bowl 7, a ring-shaped interlaid backstop 4 mounted on the outer shell so as

to maintain an “air gap.” However, claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitation of cooker bowl having a radially shrunk bottom part in the shape of a either a step or a conical cylinder. Patent ‘111 does not teach or disclose this limitation. Therefore, patent ‘111 does not anticipate the present invention and claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, should be allowed.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS--35 U.S.C. § 103**

Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 as being unpatentably distinguishable over the prior references. Since claims 8 and 9 are withdrawn from consideration, Applicant does not traverse this rejection.

#### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Examiner has objected to claims 6 and 7 as being dependent upon a rejected claim. Since by the present Amendment shown above, claims 6 and 7 have been withdrawn from consideration, Applicant does not traverse this rejection.

## CONCLUSIONS

Applicant has reviewed the prior art cited by Examiner in the Notice of References Cited of the Office Action and asserts that none of the prior art references, either alone or in combination, are relevant to the patentability of the Applicant's invention as currently claimed.

Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw all objections and rejections with regard to the above-referenced claims in reliance on one or more of the grounds submitted by Applicant. In light of the amendments and the arguments made by Applicant above, Applicant submits that all existing claims are now in a condition for allowance.

If there are any outstanding issues, which the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Colin P. Cahoon at 972-367-2001.

Respectfully submitted by:



Colin P. Cahoon  
Registration No. 38,836  
CARSTENS & CAHOON, LLP  
PO Box 802334  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 367-2001  
(972) 367-2002 Fax

Date: June 10, 2005